IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

SINGULAR COMPUTING LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

C.A. No. 1:19-cv-12551-FDS

GOOGLE LLC,

Hon. F. Dennis Saylor IV

Defendant.

DEFENDANT GOOGLE LLC'S PROPOSED VERDICT FORM

Case 1:19-cv-12551-FDS Document 679 Filed 12/29/23 Page 2 of 12

In the course of your deliberations, you are to answer the following questions and fill out

this Verdict Form. When answering the following questions and filling out this Verdict Form,

please follow the directions provided throughout this Form. Your answers to each question must

be unanimous. Please refer to the Jury Instructions for guidance on the law applicable to the subject

matter covered by each question. You are to answer each and every question, unless otherwise

directed. As used herein:

• "'273 patent" means U.S. Patent No. 8,407,273;

• "156 patent" means U.S. Patent No. 9,218,156;

• "Singular" means Plaintiff Singular Computing LLC; and

• "Google" means Defendant Google LLC.

NEXT STEP: Proceed to Question 1.

1

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

We, the jury, unanimously agree to the answers to the following questions and return them under the instructions of this Court as our verdict in this case.

I. INFRINGEMENT

1. Has Singular proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Google's Tensor Processor Units (TPUv2 and TPUv3) infringe claim 53 of the '273 patent and/or claim 7 of the '156 patent?

"YES" is a finding for Singular.

"NO" is a finding for Google.

Claim & Patent	YES	NO
Claim 53 of the '273 patent		
Claim 7 of the '156 patent		

NEXT STEP: Proceed to Question 2.

II. INVALIDITY

2. Has Google proven by clear and convincing evidence that claim 53 of the '273 patent and/or claim 7 of the '156 patent is invalid as anticipated by prior art?

"YES" is a finding for Google.

"NO" is a finding for Singular.

Claim & Patent	YES	NO
Claim 53 of the '273 patent		
Claim 7 of the '156 patent		

NEXT STEP: Proceed to Question 3.

- 3. Has Google proven by clear and convincing evidence that claim 53 of the '273 patent and/or claim 7 of the '156 patent is invalid as obvious in view of prior art? "YES" is a finding for Google.
 - "NO" is a finding for Singular.

Claim & Patent	YES	NO
Claim 53 of the '273 patent		
Claim 7 of the '156 patent		

NEXT STEP: If you answered YES in either row in Question 1 <u>AND</u> answered NO for the corresponding rows in Question 2 <u>AND</u> Question 3, then proceed to Question 4. Otherwise, SKIP the remaining questions and sign and date the verdict form.

III. DAMAGES

4.	Has Singular proven by a preponderance of the evidence that it marked substantially all S1 chips/boards with the patent numbers of the '273 patent and the '156 patent prior to December 2019?							
	"YES" is a finding for Singular.							
	"NO" is a finding for Google.							
	YES NO							

NEXT STEP: Proceed to Question 5.

5.	Has Singular proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the S1 chips/board were not made, offered for sale, or sold within the United States, or imported int the United States, at any time before December 2019?							
	"YES" is a finding for Singular.							
	"NO" is a finding for Google.							
	YES NO							

NEXT STEP: Proceed to Question 6.

ó.		• /					_	has	Singular	proven	by	a
									(sta	ate the ar	nour	ıt)
).	`	` • /	· • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	b. What (if any) lump-sum amount of damages preponderance of the evidence should be awarded?	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	preponderance of the evidence should be awarded?	preponderance of the evidence should be awarded?	What (if any) lump-sum amount of damages has Singular proven by preponderance of the evidence should be awarded? (state the amount of damages has Singular proven by preponderance of the evidence should be awarded?

NEXT STEP: Proceed to Question 7.

IV. WILLFULNESS

	Foreperson		Date	
Your delibe	rations are complete. Plea	se sign and date this	form, and notify the court (officer
		YES	NO	
	"NO" is a finding for Goo	ogle.		
	"YES" is a finding for Sin	ngular.		
7.	<u> </u>	• • •	of the evidence that God/or claim 7 of the '156 pate	_

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 29, 2023 By: /s/ Nathan R. Speed

Gregory F. Corbett (BBO #646394) gcorbett@wolfgreenfield.com Nathan R. Speed (BBO #670249) nspeed@wolfgreenfield.com Elizabeth A. DiMarco (BBO #681921) edimarco@wolfgreenfield.com

edimarco@wolfgreenfield.com Anant K. Saraswat (BBO #676048) asaraswat@wolfgreenfield.com

WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.

600 Atlantic Avenue Boston, MA 02210

Telephone: (617) 646-8000

Fax: (617) 646-8646

Robert Van Nest (admitted pro hac vice)

rvannest@keker.com

Michelle Ybarra (admitted *pro hac vice*)

mybarra@keker.com

Andrew Bruns (admitted *pro hac vice*)

abruns@keker.com

Vishesh Narayen (admitted *pro hac vice*)

vnarayen@keker.com

Christopher S. Sun (admitted *pro hac vice*)

csun@keker.com

Anna Porto (admitted pro hac vice)

aporto@keker.com

Deeva Shah (admitted *pro hac vice*)

dshah@keker.com

Stephanie J. Goldberg (admitted *pro hac vice*)

sgoldberg@keker.com

Eugene M. Paige (admitted pro hac vice)

epaige@keker.com

Rachael E. Meny (admitted *pro hac vice*)

rmeny@keker.com

Eric K. Phung (admitted *pro hac vice*)

ephung@keker.com

Kaiyi A. Xie (admitted pro hac vice)

kxie@keker.com

Spencer McManus (admitted pro hac vice)

smcmanus@keker.com

KEKER, VAN NEST & PETERS LLP

633 Battery Street

San Francisco, CA 94111-1809

Telephone: (415) 391-5400

Michael S. Kwun (admitted *pro hac vice*) mkwun@kblfirm.com
Asim M. Bhansali (admitted *pro hac vice*) abhansali@kblfirm.com
KWUN BHANSALI LAZARUS LLP
555 Montgomery Street, Suite 750
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 630-2350

Matthias A. Kamber (admitted *pro hac vice*) matthiaskamber@paulhastings.com
PAUL HASTINGS LLP
101 California Street, 48th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 856-7000
Fax: (415) 856-7100

Ginger D. Anders (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Ginger.Anders@mto.com
J. Kain Day (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Kain.Day@mto.com
MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
601 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Suite 500E
Washington, D.C. 20001
Tel: (202) 220-1100

Jordan D. Segall (admitted *pro hac vice*) Jordan.Segall@mto.com MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP 350 South Grand Avenue, 50th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071-3426 Tel: (213) 683-9100

Counsel for Defendant Google LLC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that this document is being filed through the Court's electronic filing system, which serves counsel for other parties who are registered participants as identified on the Notice of Electronic Filing (NEF). Any counsel for other parties who are not registered participants are being served by first class mail on the date of electronic filing.

/s/ Nathan R. Speed

Nathan R. Speed